

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

MAR 29 1996

From: Scott.Boland <sboland@texas.net>
To: A16.A16(rm8775)
Date: 3/28/96 11:06am
Subject: RM 8775 : ACCT Petition fails to serve the public interest

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

America's Telecommunication carriers are one amongst many victims of the Internet. Radio, Television, Mail, Telephone, and Telegraph are all methods of communication easily handled by the Internet. All of these services send information from one place to another, but not all of these are controlled by the FCC. None of these carriers of information operate under the exact same body of laws within any single country, much less across the globe.

Transmission of information is one of great inventions of mankind. At every stage of history, new methods of recording and transmitting have changed what is possible. The Internet makes it possible to handle not only these older and established methods of communication on a global scale, but allows for entirely new methods of communication that was never before possible. If we force the Internet to follow the rules established for previous methods, we also limit it to providing only the services that were previously possible. If we place arbitrary limitations on where and how information is to be transmitted, we will place a unpardonable burden on the general public.

If the public good is the primary concern, let us examine what people want and need. People want convenience, reliability, and innovation.

If the public finds it more convenient to use the internet to carry their conversations than current telephone services, why should we make it more difficult? The internet has proven its ability to provide these services when they are needed, why should we place new restrictions on where and how communications will be made? The challenge of carrying new and innovative services is not being met by the telecommunication carriers, why should we hobble one of the most dynamic and expressive sources of innovation on the planet?

This petition contends that the telephone companies are unfairly burdened by laws that this new medium is not bound by. These laws were put in place to aid in their growth, restrict their abuses, and to aid the general public. Why must these rules be applied to the internet? It's growth is astronomical. It's abuses are few, and generally avoidable by anyone not looking to be abused. The general public has been treated to a method of exchange less limited than telephones, more interactive than television, more personalized than radio, and faster than telegraph or mail. How will the public good best be served? The telecommunication carriers promised the limited bonus of carrying a picture with the voice decades ago, and has still not delivered. The internet makes this possible NOW.

This petition charges that this service is being provided 'for free'. They claim that without a proper method of collecting fees the infra- structure will collapse. I see no signs of this mythical collapse, or 'free' services. The amount of funds being pumped into the internet is still growing exponentially. Much of it by these same companies whining about unfair competition. I have to pay for my connections. Everyone who owns a connection must pay for it. Anyone wanting the additional bandwidth to handle voice messages must pay for it. The costs are directly related to the amount of data one wants to have available. To contend that voice software is available for a single fee is extremely misleading. The software is useless without using the internet to carry the data. This is akin to saying that a paper cup is a telecommunication provider because one could connect it with a string to the house next door.

The FCC was created to serve the citizens of the United States. It would be a grave disservice to unilaterally burden these citizens with an archaic method of communication to protect an industry that is unwilling to change.

CC: FCCMAIL.SMTP("hm8775")

No. of Copies rec'd
List ABCDE

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

MAR 29 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

From: Tony Loro <classvtony@oro.net>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 3/7/96 4:06am
Subject: internet use of voice data

I am very disturbed by the Amercia=B9s Carriers Telecommunication =

Associations petition for regulation of internet use of voice data =

transfer.

I believe the internet should NOT be regulated.

Data transfer of all types should be allowed.

There should be NO restrictions placed on software companies who =

have made this service viable. These Big League Carrier Crybabies =

should be forced to compete at all levels and not have anymore =

special laws favoring their profit positions.

Charles Helein is completely wrong in his arguments.

BTW I currently do not use this software or data type, but might and =

I do not want my future use restricted

Please keep on any mail lists addressing this issue.

Tony Loro classvtony@oro.net

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

From: modo55 <modo55@dal.cleaf.com>
To: A16.A16(rm8775)
Date: 3/28/96 8:52pm
Subject: rm no. 8775-acta

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

MAR 29 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

gentlemen:

I feel American 's rights are being tested again by the ACTA filing against the internet/internet phone.

Only a very, very, small percent of all people who use the telephone are using the internet phone. Most of the people who do use the internet phone are using it for leisure fun and not as a replacement for the regular phone.

The quality of the internet phone does not even come close to that of a regular phone=plus= to talk to a certian person=that person has to have the same internet phone software.

I think the ACTA is way out in left field with this case filing. The same ACTA phone company members are getting additional revenue off thier lines due to the traffic on the internet. The internet is not owned by any one company and therefore should not be restricted in this manner by ACTA.

I have been using the internet phone since january 1, 1996 and nearly all people I talk to on the internet phone are just "using it for fun".

The only thing ACTA has to gain by this case is getting alot of people not liking the phone companies in that group even more.

I protest to this case alot.

gerald moody
322 lakepark rd #511 lewisville tx 75057

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

MAR 29 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

From: Ted C Hsiao <thsiao@aspect.com>
To: A16.A16(rm8775)
Date: 3/29/96 3:50am
Subject: My regard to "Rulemaking No. 8775"

Dear Madam/Sir:

I saw the FCC REQUEST FOR COMMENT ON ACTA PETITION RELATING TO "INTERNET PHONE" SOFTWARE AND HARDWARE - RM No. 8775

I want to give my support to the so called "Internet Phone" software and hardware. As we are entering to the next century, information highway will eventually be our future way of communication. Digital channel should be intergrated in a way that all text, graphic, sound formats can be transmitted in the channel.

Ban the "internet phone" technology, in my idea, will only cause technology lag and communication monopoly. Regulations for this kind of multimedia channel should be created and followed, but ban it doesn't seem to make the world better!

Thank you for your patient.

Best regard

Ted Hsiao

~ \\|// ~
~ || ~ ~ || ~
~ (/ @ @ /) ~
~ -oOOo-()-oOOo- ~
 Ted (hsiao@netcom.COM) NCU.EE.1987

No. of Copies rec'd
List ABCDE

1

RECEIVED

MAR 29 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

From: Paul Scheele <paulsc@america.net>
To: A16.A16(rm8775)
Date: 3/28/96 8:27pm
Subject: RM No. 8775 Informal Comment

Concerning the ACTA proposal that the FCC initiate a Declaratory Ruling, Special Relief, and/or Institution of Rulemaking to prohibit or regulate use of the Internet for voice communications by any means, this is an informal comment submitted to express my view that:

Whereas:

- 1) The Internet is only a group of interconnected interoperable computer networks running a common set of communications protocols, whose address space is administered centrally for the convenience of all users, and
- 2) Significant portions of the Internet are privately owned, but may or may not carry traffic on the basis of choices of owners, operators, or other persons neither known to or under the control of other users, owners of facilities, or operators of facilities, and
- 3) Immediate low cost communications are advantageous to the public as a whole, and
- 4) It is neither technically practical, nor economically feasible for any provider of services to filter from a large stream of packets only those containing certain types of data, and therefore, no technical means of regulating any particular type of traffic exists, and
- 5) In the absence of any technical means of control, no practical means of enforcement of any rulemaking would be possible, and

Whereas

- 6) It is in the interest of the public that experimentation with new technical means of signaling and new means of provision of established services be encouraged, and
- 7) The total volume of traffic for which rulings are sought is a minute fraction of 1% of the comparable service traffic carried by the petitioners, and
- 8) The U.S. Federal courts at all levels have held in the AT&T breakup case that increased competition in the provision of long distance services is in the public interest,

then the plea of the petitioner, ACTA, seems without merit, and should not be acted upon by the Commission. Moreover, the Commission should dismiss the petition, and in doing so, should reserve to a future time not less than 5 years from the date of dismissal any consideration of similar petitions, so as to allow a reasonable period for development of the technology in question, and the emergence of actual services which would require regulation.

Any loss of revenue to the complainants could be easily forestalled by actions of the complainants themselves, which could make their considerable lead in many technical and business areas insurmountable. Thus it is the responsibility of the Commission, acting in the public interest, to dismiss this petition as a means of encouraging healthy technical competition and fostering free trade.

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

RECEIVED

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

MAR 29 1996

From: MR RON H LANDY <EQHT76A@prodigy.com>
To: A16.A16(rm8775)
Date: 3/28/96 5:58pm
Subject: Free long distance telephone calls.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

I am delighted that technology is allowing users on the internet to make free long distance telephone calls and i hope and pray nothing will be done by the FCC to stop this great potential consumer benefit.

I met my fiancée through Prodigy (she lives in San Francisco and I live in Florida) and we talk each night. Our combined long distance charges are more than \$500 per month which we are happy to pay but it strains our budgets. Free internet calls are vital to us.
.until I move to San Francisco (which I am planning to do next year).

I understand the long distance companies trying to stop this because it will cost them money. I imagine horse and buggy companies wanted to stop the automobile when it was developed too...but progress is inevitable and life goes on.

To cave into their requests would be a disservice to everyone living in the United States, and you agency is supposed to be acting in the public interest. everyone should have and will have the capacity to use this technology and the government should not put a roadblock to this great innovation which will raise the standard of living for individuals and economically benefit corporations.

Ron Landy
6415 North US 1
Fort Pierce FL 34946

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____